

REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 6-7, 10-12, 15-18, 22-25 and 27-30 remain in the application. Claims 1-5, 8-9, 13-14, 19-21 and 26 have been cancelled. Claims 6-7, 10-12 and 16 have been indicated as being allowable. Claims 15, 17 and 18 have been amended herein.

Claims 15, 17 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as lacking sufficient antecedent basis. Claims 15, 17 and 18 have been amended to depend from allowed claim 12 as opposed to cancelled claim 14. Allowed claim 12 provides sufficient antecedent basis for claims 15, 17 and 18. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 15, 17 and 18 under §112 is respectfully requested. An indication of the allowability of claims 15, 17 and 18 is respectfully requested.

Claims 22, 23, 24 and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent 6,636,256 to Passman et al (hereinafter Passman) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication US 2001/0032335 to Jones (hereinafter Jones), U.S. Patent 5,917,405 to Joao (hereinafter Joao) and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,675,386 to Hendricks (hereinafter Hendricks). For the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is traversed.

The present invention is directed to a communications system and method incorporating a plurality of vehicle mounted web cams that collect video information and

transmit the video information together with other local information via a wireless network to a server. The video streams from the web cams and associated information are available to users on an internet web page. Each camera has a specific identifier to permit users to access the video of specific individual cameras. Optimization software permits users to take virtual trips along predetermined routes. The system permits sequential access to multiple video feeds from desired locations. The system also permits a plurality of communication system users to access and display video information from the server.

Passman discloses a video communication system that transmits real-time information from a video monitoring system in a mobile vehicle to an internet website. The website can be accessed by persons through their computer that is connected to the Internet. Antennas are used for a global positioning system signal transmission and reception and for conventional RF communications.

Jones discloses a picture communications system for use in real-time communications. The system enables an originating user (i) to initiate a contact with another user, (ii) to receive an essentially immediate response as to the remote user's device status and willingness to receive an image from said originating user, (iii) to capture and send the image essentially immediately, and (iv) to engage in a useful real-time exchange with the remote user regarding the image; all in a manner consistent with the spontaneous and immediate nature of a telephone call.

Joao is directed to an apparatus for remote control, monitoring and/or security of vehicles. The vehicle equipment system may include video recording or photographing equipment. The video recording devices may be located at any location on the interior

of the vehicle or the exterior. Real-time or deferred video transmission to a user is utilized.

Hendricks is directed to a method and apparatus for communicating multiple live video feeds over the internet. Users are able to remotely control a video picture of a distant location. Text, graphics, and other video information may supplement one or more video pictures to provide an educational and entertaining system. The invention of Hendricks may be used to automatically monitor a remote region for activity. A processor may monitor multiple cameras or a digital wide-angle video for pixel changes indicating a desired event.

There is no motivation or suggestion in the art of record to combine the Passman and Hendricks references in the manner proposed by the Examiner. The present invention, as claimed in claim 22, requires a step wherein optical searching is performed, using a means for searching, on transmitted information to locate video information containing desired information. As described above, Hendricks teaches automatic monitoring of camera output representing a region for activity (see Hendricks column 19, lines 28-41). As an example, Hendricks suggests that an approaching lion in an otherwise inactive desert environment will cause a moving pattern to form on a camera's output or in the wide angle image wherein a processor may detect the pattern and alert a wildlife research that an event is occurring. There is no suggestion, however, in the art to utilize this type of output monitoring in the system taught by Passman. Passman teaches that human surveillance is used to recognize for example, youths fighting on a school bus. There is no suggestion to utilize a processor to detect anomalies within a camera's output. Unlike the system taught by Hendricks where any

motion indicates an observable event, the subjects of observation in Passman will typically be in constant motion and as such the monitoring method taught by Hendricks would not be beneficial to the system of Passman. Because such a combination of the teachings of Passman and Hendricks is not suggested in the art of record, such a combination is improper. Thus, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 22 is respectfully requested.

Claims 23, 24 and 30 depend directly or indirectly from claim 22 and as such are believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 23, 24 and 30 is respectfully requested.

Claims 25 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Passman in view of Jones.

In regard to amended claim 25, Applicant maintains that even if the references were combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner, the present invention would not result. The combination does not teach or suggest a server that classifies video information into public information accessible to all of a plurality of display sources and private information accessible to only a selected number of the plurality of display sources. Rather, the combination, specifically the teachings of Jones, teaches restriction on a user by user basis instead of on a content-specific basis. For example, from paragraph [75] of Jones, if user A has access rights to device B, then user A can connect to device B. If device B is a viewer then user A has the right to connect to device B for the purpose of sending a picture file to device B. Although user-based and device-based limitations are taught, there is no content based limitation taught.

Claim 28 depends directly from amended claim 25 and is believed to be

allowable for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 25 and 28 is respectfully requested.

Claims 27 and 29 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Passman in view of Jones and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,793,420 to Schmidt (hereinafter Schmidt).

Schmidt discloses a vehicle video system including multiple cameras. Two cameras are mounted to the outside of the bus, being attached at the driver's side of the bus and the side opposite the driver's side of the bus. The third camera is attached inside the bus and may be mounted to the rear view mirror. The cameras located outside the bus view an area where traffic approaches and passes the bus. The camera located inside the bus views the passenger compartment therein.

The Examiner states that it would be obvious to combine the teachings of Schmidt regarding cameras that record information outside of a bus with the teachings of Passman. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant maintains there is no motivation in the art of record to make a combination in this manner. Passman teaches using a camera to monitor potential fights on a bus. Adding a camera to the outside of a bus does nothing to help this type of monitoring process as such a camera only views outside of the bus. And although some acts of breaking the law (vandalism) may be observed by outside cameras, these are not acts whose control is contemplated in Passman. As such, the combination of references is improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 27 and 29 is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is

invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 18-0160, our Order No. HRA-12428.

Respectfully submitted,

RANKIN, HILL, PORTER & CLARK LLP

By James Balazs
James A. Balazs, Reg. No. 47401

4080 Erie Street
Willoughby, Ohio 44094-7836
(216) 566-9700